689

LAW SECRETARIAT.

No. 4174 (1)—*Legis.* 33-29-1, *dated 7th February* 1930.

The accompanying report of the Cow Protection Committee appointed in Government Proceedings No. P. 710-26—Legis. 12-26-1, dated 10th August 1926, is hereby published for general information.

By Order,
P. MAHADEVAYYA,
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

Report of the Committee appointed by the Government to consider the desirability or otherwise of undertaking legislation or other action to prevent slaughter of cows in the Mysore State.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

1. *Appointment of the Committee.*

(1) The question of undertaking legislation for the prevention of slaughter of cows in the State was repeatedly pressed on the attention of Government in some form or other in the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council. Representations and Memorials on the subject were received in very large numbers from various Humanitarian Leagues or Associations in and outside Mysore. Finally, in connection with a resolution moved in the Representative Assembly Session of June 1926 that legislation might be undertaken for the prevention of the slaughter of cows, Government promised that a Committee would be appointed to consider the whole subject, and in pursuance of the above, Government in their Order No. P. 710-26—Legis. 12-26-1, dated 10th August 1926, appointed a Committee.

2. *Personnel of the Committee.*

(2) The Committee as originally constituted consisted of the following members:—

1. Rajasabhabhushana Diwan Bahadur Sir K. P. Puttanna Chetty, Kt., C.I.E., (President).
2. Mushir-ul-Mulk, Mir Humza Hussein, B.A., B.L.
3. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao, M.D.
4. Mr. D. V. Gundappa.
5. ,, B. Abdur Rahmon, B.A.
6. ,, M. Ramachandra Rao Sindhia.
7. ,, Sylvester Pais, B.A.
8. ,, S. Venkatesaiya, B.A., B.L.
9. Rev. Mr. E. S. Edwards.

Mr. C. Ranganatha Rao Sahib, B.A., B.L., (Secretary).

(3) There was a slight change in the personnel of the Committee. Mr. N. Rama Rao, B A., B.L., Secretary to Government, Development Departments, succeeded Mr. C. Ranganatha Rao Sahib, B.A., B L., as Secretary to the Committee, in February 1927. Rev. Mr. E. S. Edwards, having laid down his membership of the Committee consequent on his departure from India, Rev. J. A. Vanes, B A., was appointed a member of the Committee in his stead in June 1927. But, unfortunately he too did not serve in the Committee very long. He was able to attend only one important meeting of the Committee held to receive the oral evidence of witnesses. The Committee suffered a great and irreparable loss in the death of Mushir-ul-Mulk Mir Humza

Hussein, whose ripe wisdom, and mature judgment would have been invaluable in directing the deliberations of the Committee, and helping it to arrive at a just conclusion.

690

3. *Terms of reference to the Committee.*

(4) Government, in constituting the Committee requested them to "consider the laws in force in this respect in British India and other Indian States, take evidence on the religious, social and economic aspects involved, and submit to Government their recommendations as to the desirability or otherwise of undertaking legislation or taking other steps for preventing the slaughter of cows."

4. *Synopsis of work done by the Committee.*

(5) There were altogether seven meetings of the Committee as noted in the margin.

25th August 1926.
25th September 1926.
9th October 1926.
25th May 1927.
28th October 1927.
29th October 1927.
14th November 1927.
8th May 1928
9th May 1928.

(6) At the first meeting of the Committee, a Sub-Committee was formed to frame a questionnaire with the aid of questions suggested by some members of the Committee. The Sub-Committee met on 9th October 1926 and after very careful consideration, finally framed a comprehensive questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix I.

(7) About 700 copies of the questionnaire printed in English, Kannada and Hindustani, were issued to the public, including several newspapers, magazines, etc., and leaders of thought, both in and outside the Mysore State. It was also published in several local newspapers. One month's time was given to the public for sending replies to the questionnaire at the first instance; but, at the request of the public, it was extended by another month. In all 340 replies were received, including notes on the subject. Eleven witnesses were subsequently orally examined by the Committee on the 28th and 29th October 1927; of whom six were taken from among the witnesses who had already tendered their evidence in writing, and five were new witnesses specially selected as competent to throw light on the points under consideration. Of replies received 266 are from Hindus, 52 from Mahomadans, 15 from Christians and 12 from others, such as, Jains. Of the total number of opinions received for consideration, 38 are from Associations, Sanghams and the like.

(8) The written evidence tabulated, as well as the oral evidence will be found in Vol. II.

Acknowledgments.

(9) The Committee received in addition numerous notes and memoranda on different aspects of their enquiry from several departmental officers, local bodies in Mysore, from other Governments and also from private gentlemen and they take this opportunity of acknowledging the very ready response made to their many requisitions and the large measure of help they received from all of them.

CHAPTER II.

Scope of the investigations of the Committee.

(10) As a preliminary step in their work, the Committee obtained through the Residency copies of the various legislative enactments in force in several British Indian Provinces and in Native States. A copy of the Laws and Rules in force in the above States is found in Appendix II.

Synopsis of the information contained therein.

691

(11) With respect to British India, it is stated that apart from the provision in the Municipal and District or Local Boards Acts for regulating the slaughter of animals, there are no laws or rules in force in any province in British India prohibiting the slaugher of cows.

(12) It is understood that attempts were recently made to amend the Local Self-Goverment legislation with a view to restricting and prohibiting the slaughter of cows but they are reported to have failed everywhere as sanction was refused in all cases except in that of the Calcutta Municipal Bill in which, however, the provincial legislature rejected the clause on the subject.

(13) The rules framed by the Central Provices Government given below are an interesting instance of a provision intended to protect cows by regulating the slaughter of animals:—

* * *

"(4) Every animal brougt for slaughter at a slaughter house shall be presented for examination by the supervisor.

(5) The following animals shall be rejected and returned to the owner;—

(*i*) Any animal which in the opinion of the supervisor is—

(*a*) pregnant or (*b*) in milk.

(*ii*) All cows.

(*iii*) Any animal other than sheep or goats which in the opinion of the Supervisor, is of or under the age of 9 years."

(14) It is not known whether similar rules have been framed any other part of British India.

(15) In Indian States and particularly in those situated in Northern India, legislation has been introduced prohibiting the slaughter not only of cows but of all horned cattle. In some States in Rajputana and Central India however there are no such laws, probably because slaughter is so effectually prevented by public opinion that there is no need for legislative action. Recently laws have been passed in these States prohibiting the export of cows and other horned cattle either absolutely or for purposes of slaughter.

(16) In Hyderabad, H. E. H. the Nizam issued a *firman* prohibiting the slaughter of cows and camels in his dominions for purposes of sacrifice on Bakrid day as "the flesh of these animals is unpalatable and costly during the present days of high prices."

(17) In Baroda there is no legislative enactment prohibiting the killing of cattle but a Notification was issued in 1916 prohibiting cow-killing within the limits of the Raj for the ostensible purpose of preserving peace and unity among people of different religions.

(18) In Kashmir, the slaughter of cows is prohibited by a law which prescribes a penalty of imprisonment up to 10 years for its violation. The slaughter of cow, buffaloes and the possession of the flesh of either animal is also prohibited.

(19) In the marginally noted States in Rajaputana, laws have been passed prohibiting the killing of all horned cattle.

Jhalwar, Kotah, Bikaner, Bharatpur, Karauli, Dungarpur, Nanswara and Jaisalmer.

(20) In Jodhpur and Partabgarh States kine killing is prohibited but no special rules have been issued. In Kushalgari although no special rules have been promulgated, cow-killing is dealt with under the provisions relating to "mischief" in the Indian Penal Code.

(21) As already stated the slaughter of cows is prohibited in most of the States of Central India although actual enactments prohibiting such slaughter is rarely to be found on the Statute books. In the Panna State an Act entitled "the Cattle

Preservation Act" was enacted in 1920 prohibiting the export of horned cattle for the purpose of slaughter. In the Rewa State slaughter of horned cattle is prohibited by an order issued in 1910, by His Highness the Maharaja which prescribes imprisonment for 5 years as penalty for its violation. A circular order has also been issued in this State strictly prohibiting all export of horned cattle.

Nawanagar, Palitana, Wanakaner, Rajkot, Porbandar, Gondal, Limdi, Dharangadhara.

(22) The marginally noted States of Western India have also prohibited either by legislation or by means of executive orders the killing of horned cattle or its export outside for purposes of slaughter.

CHAPTER III.

Report.

(23) The questionnaire was framed by the Committee after very careful consideration of the several issues raised by the subject. At the final meeting held on 8th and 9th May 1928, when all the Members were present it was decided that the evidence could be most conveniently discussed with reference to the questions in the order in which they were grouped in the questionaire and this was accordingly done. The opinion of the Committee was unanimous on all the issues.

Statistics.

(24) With a view to ascertain the exact extent to which the slaughter of cattle prevails in the State, and to obtain some idea of its distribution, the Deputy Commissioners of Districts were requested to furnish detailed figures showing the different kinds of horned cattle slaughtered within their jurisdiction for three years from 1923-24. To provide some test of the accuracy of the statistical information available they were also requested to have detailed accounts kept of the cattle slaughtered for three months from September 1926 and to furnish exact figures for that period. The information obtained in response to this request is given in Appendix III.

(25) It will be observed that the figures relate only to the slaughter in the several Municipal areas and leaves out of account of slaughter that takes places in shandies and in places outside the headquarter towns. The information therefore cannot be regarded as anything more than a very rough indication of the volume of cattle slaughter in the several Districts. From the returns furnished it would seem that the largest number of cattle are slaughtered in Bangalore and Kolar Districts, probably owing to the fact that these districts contain a large floating population of beef eating classes; and that on the whole about 15,000 cattle are slaughtered annually in the District Headquarter towns, other than Bangalore City where there is no slaughter and the beef required for consumption is brought in from the Civil and Military Station.

(26) The total number of cattle slaughtered in the State is estimated by some witnesses at 2 to 3 lakhs. From the information available it would seem that less than a half number slaughtered consists of aged and barren cows, and that the remainder is made up of bullocks aged, defective or otherwise unfit for service. There is no record of the slaughter of pregnant or milch cows. It is unlikely that local sentiment which is very strong in rural parts would permit of the slaughter of cows, to any appreciable extent and such slaughter is probably confined to the large Municipal towns, where the mixed nature of the population and the preoccupations of business prevent it from attracting much attention.

(27) The problem before us may be broadly considered under 3 heads *viz.*, (i) the religious aspect (ii) the social aspect and (iii) the economic aspect.

693

Religious aspect.

(28) There can be no doubt whatever that the Hindu religion, meaning thereby the peligion followed to-day by the Hindu population of the State, is very strongly and definitely opposed to the slaughter of cows. It seems to us beside the point to argue that at some remote period in the past cow slaughter was enjoined in the Vedas. It is an undoubted fact that present day Hinduism forbids cow slaughter and that present day Hindu sentiment views such slaughter with abhorrence. It is the pressure of this live sentiment in India which has been forcing the prevention of cow slaughter to the forefront of practical politics, and it does not seem to us prudent to ignore its strength and reality. It would be safe to start with the assumption that Hindu sentiment in the State, as elsewhere in India, is strongly opposed to the slaughter of cows.

(29) Out of 266 opinions received from Hindus as many as 248 advocated legislation for prohibiting the slaughter of cows, and of these only 3 were in favour of the prohibition of slaughter of all cattle. Seven were in favour of legislation for partial prohibition of cow slaughter and six though opposed to cow slaughter were still not in favour of legislation for this purpose. Only two remained neutral. Of 12 opinions received from Jains all were in favour of prevention of cattle slaughter and 11 strongly advocated prohibition by law.

(30) There is equally little doubt that the bulk of Mahommedan opinion is opposed to prohibition of cow slaughter. Of 52 opinions received from Mahomedans only 9 were in favour of prohibition of slaughter or protection of cows, while 32 were entirely opposed to it and 4 advocated prohibition by propaganda. The opposition is based on many grounds, but religion is mainly stressed, some Mahomedan witnesses urging the religious objection with great warmth, and deprecating prohibition as an unwarranted interference with the behests of religion. Texts are quoted from the Koran to show that cow sacrifice is enjoined by the Prophet, and *per contra* much ingenuity is exercised by some to explain away the texts as bearing only an allegorical sense, and therefore not to be literally interpreted. We deem it unnecessary to pronounce on this controversy, because we are more concerned with the actual belief of the bulk of Mahomedans in the State than with nice points of textual interpretation, and in regard to this we have no doubt that this community object to a general prohibition of cow slaughter on conscientious grounds. Though there is clear and abundant proof of this belief we may note in passing that there is no evidence that cows are really sacrificed at least to any extent in the State from religious motives. It does not seem to be the common practice. Both people who would prohibit and people who are opposed to prohibition base their opinion on religious, economic and humanitarian grounds. The majority of Hindus and Mahommedans stress religion, but urge also other reasons, which seem invariably to follow religious prepossessions.

(31) With the Christian community religious considerations do not enter into the question at all, and it becomes purely a matter of how far deference to the rooted sentiment of the majority of follow subjects would justify interference with the rights of private property and individual liberty. Of the 15 Christians whose opinions are on record only 2 are in favour of legislation against cow-slaughter, and 10 are entirely opposed to it. Their point of view is clearly and authoritatively put by his Lordship the Bishop of Mysore on behalf of the Catholic community and generally by the Rev. Mr. E. S. Edwards. The general impression left by the evidence is that though the Christian community would acquiesce in any measure likely to promote inter communal harmony, they think legislation would be justified only if there were a very general demand for the removal of an undoubted abuse, or if it were necessary to prevent serious communal differences. Even then, propaganda for the education of public

opinion is in the view of this community, a better and more legitimate instrument of prohibition than legislation. On the economic and humanitarian issues, Christian opinion is definitely against legislative prohibition.

(32) It is a matter for gratification that in Mysore there has been no case of intercommunal discord arising out of differences relating to cow slaughter.

Food Supply.

(33) There is no doubt that beef is an important part of the food supply of the State. The population which either eats beef or is not prevented by religion from eating it, is 13 laks out of a total population of 58 lakhs. Some witnesses estimate that beef constitutes about a third part of the food consumed by these people, and that it is prized as a very cheap and nourishing article of diet. It is stated that beef is the only meat accessible to a large number of poor families, and that its deprivation would be keenly felt in their every-day lives. It is urged that prohibition of cattle slaughter would send up the price of mutton, by making the beef-eating classess well the demand for it, and that there would be a general disturbance of equilibrium of food supply in the State. Though the importance of beef in the dietary of the State is possibly exaggerated, there seems to be no doubt that anything calculated to seriously retrench its supply would cause appreciable hardship to certain classes, especially the poorer sections of these classes of the community.

AS PER CENSUS REPORT OF 1921.

Beef eating population.—

	Lakhs.
Holeyas about	6¼
Madigas do	2¼
Mahomedans about	3½
Christians do	½
Total about	13

Total population.—

Hindus	54,15,636
Mahommadans	3,15,357
Christians	44,705
Jains	20,097
Sikhs	25
Brahmo	33
Buddists	1,128
Parsi	94
Jews	9
Others	62,835
Total about	58 lakhs

(34) It was not possible in the nature of things to obtain the recorded opinions of the depressed classes, who are among the communities most directly affected by the prohibition of the slaughter of cattle for food. From the resolutions passed at the various communal gatherings organised among them, these classes appear to be getting more and more permeated by Hindu feelings and ideals; and there seems to be among them a movement to cast off habits of food and drink which have hitherto branded them with the stigma of inferiority, and isolated them from social intercourse with the rest of the population. It has not been possible to predicate exactly what the mental attitude of these classes is in regard to the question with which we are concerned. The incidence of any measure prohibiting cattle slaughter on the well-being of these classes must necessarily be a strong consideration in arriving at an ultimate decision of this subject.

Effect of prohibition on food supply.

(35) In regard to the effect of the prohibition of cow slaughter on the food supply, as well as in regard to the other questions of an economic nature, we observe that the opinions held are strongly tinctured by the prepossessions of the deponants in respect of the main issue. Persons who, by religion or sentiment, are opposed to cow slaughter in the abstract, assert that prohibition would not affect the food supply, but the reasons given in support of this opinion are unconvincing and sometimes fantastic. There seems to us little doubt that a total prohibition of the slaughter of cattle, or even of cows, would affect the food supply of the State to a certain extent, and particularly affect the poorest sections of the beef-eating communities.

695

Effect of slaughter on the breed of cattle.

(36) The opinions in regard to the effect of slaughter on the breed of cattle are another illustration of how views are influenced by pre-possessions. The bulk of the Hindu deponents assert that the breed of cattle as a whole would improve by the prohibition of slaughter, though the reasons given for holding this view are perhaps not very convincing. The Mahommedan witnesses and the Christians on the other hand say that the elimination of useless cattle will have a salutary effect on the breed. The Committee have before them the valuable opinion of Mr. William Smith, the Imperial Dairy Expert who emphatically states that "breeding would be vastly improved if all the useless and unfit cattle could be killed," and of Dr. Leslie C. Coleman, Director of Agriculture that the main obstacle to the improvement of cattle in this country is the tendency to keep a far larger number of animals than can be properly maintained, and that the cattle are in consequence so poor in quality that they cannot as a rule be regarded as worth keeping from an economic point of view. The considered opinion of the Royal Commission of Agriculture may perhaps be considered conclusive on the subject.

"We are of opinion that the Census figures suggest the existence of a vicious circle * * * As cattle grow smaller in size and greater in number, the rate at which conditions grow worse for breeding good live-stock is accelerated. For it must not be supposed that the food required by a hundred small cattle is the same in quantity as that needed by fifty of double the size. As cattle become smaller the amount of food needed in proportion to their size increases. * * * Large numbers of diminutive cattle are therefore a serious drain on a country in which the fodder supply is so scarce at certain seasons of the year as it is in India." para 168, page 191.

(37) The Royal Commission also emphasise a point on which much stress is laid by Dr. Coleman, *viz.*, that no improvement in breeding is possible, until cattle can be better fed. In view of this authoritative pronouncement it may be safely said that the total prevention of cattle slaughter cannot possibly tend towards improvement of breeds. It may even be said that the slaughter of cattle as at present practised tends to remove some of the pressure on available fodder resources. The effect of the elimination of unfit animals implied in slaughter, is to facilitate the progress of cattle improvement. It must therefore be said that the wholesale prohibition of slaughter cannot be advocated as calculated to improve the breed of cattle in the State.

Effect on milk supply and infant mortality.

(38) On this point again, the opinions expressed are strongly influenced by the religious sentiments of deponents. Hindus say that the prohibition of cow slaughter will increase milk supply and thereby reduce infant mortality, while most others are of a contrary opinion. That the prohibition of cattle slaughter would materially increase milk supply can only be inferred if it can be shown that a large number of cows which are in milk, or which are potential milk yielders are being slaughtered at present. This is however not the case. The slaughter of young cows is exceptional and rare and cows in milk or cows pregnant are seldom if even slaughtered. It seems undoubted that the milk supply is ultimately limited by the quantity of fodder available, and by the efficiency of the cow as a machine for the conversion of that fodder into milk. The Mysore Village cow is a very poor milk producer—the average yield being about ½ a seer a day, for about 150 days in the year. Dr. B. Narasimhaiengar, the Agricultural Chemist, is of opinion that the insufficiency of the milk supply in Mysore is entirely due to the poor milking quality of the indigenous cows, and that the remedy lies, not in increasing the number of animals, but in

improving their quality. He thinks that there would be more milk both absolutely, and relatively to the fodder consumed, if the cows were fewer in number, but of better breed. In his opinion no cow would be good as a commercial investment, unless she milks for 300 days in the year and gives at least an average of 3 seers of milk a day. Cost for cost, a good cow gives more milk than a bad one—that is to say, is a more efficient machine.

(39) It is the opinion of experts that Mysore has probably twice as many cattle as it can afford to maintain, and this is the starting point in the vicious circle referred to by the Royal Commission. The only way out of the situation is improvement of stock, and this necessarily implies the elimination of the unfit.

(40) The evidence shows that the price fetched by a cow as a beef animal is Rs. 5 to Rs. 15 and as any cow in milk is certainly worth very much more than this, the sale of cows for slaughter is limited only to those animals that are neither milking nor can be expected to be in milk*. It would not be incorrect to describe such animals as unfit, and therefore, the slaughter of such animals viewed in dry light, is the elimination of the unfit, which is a condition precedent to improvement of stock.

(41) We find therefore that the wholesale prohibition of slaughter of cows would not tend to increase the milk supply, and that in this view protection from slaughter is required only for actual or potential milk yielders.

Manner of disposal of useless cows.

(42) In urban parts, there is a marked tendency to sell back cows when they get dry to rural areas, so that the question resolves itself as a whole into this, what is the nature of the disposal of such cattle by the villagers? There is evidence that after more or less infructuous attempts to use them for ploughing or draft purposes, they are either sold for anything they may fetch without reference to their ultimate destination, or that they are merely turned loose to pick up such living as they can. In either case, the bulk gravitate towards urban parts, to be slaughtered for meat or hides, and a certain portion of them fall a prey to wild animals, or to the diseases consequent on neglect or malnutrition. There is no organised attempt on an appreciable scale to provide an asylum for cattle which have ceased to earn their keep, and the few pinjrapoles serve rather as centres of propaganda than as any practical solution of the problem.

Fodder.

(43) Advocates of the total prohibition of cattle slaughter say that this measure would not adversely affect the fodder problem, as the large number of cattle would produce a larger quantity of manure and thus facilitate the increased production of fodder. The others of course assert the contrary.

(44) The expert officers of the Agricultural Department are decidedly of opinion that, as by far the largest number of cattle in existence are not a good economic investment, it would be unwise to devote attention and resources to increase the supply of fodder unless at the same time an improvement could also be effected in the breed of cattle. The objective then should be both fewer and better cattle and an increase of fodder supply. To increase the fodder supply without making sure that it would be used for better stock would be economical waste as it would be throwing away resources and energy in the maintenance of useless animals which cannot be regarded as wealth.

(45) Conceding then that the supply of fodder only is about a half of what is necessary for the existing stock, even when there is no prohibition of slaughter, and conceding also that the majority of the animals slaughtered are economically

* Mr. Modi Mohamed Abdul Gafoor estimates the average value of a milch cow at Rs. 40 to 50 and that of a cow slaughtered for food at Rs. 10 to 12.

697

the most unfit of a not very valuable lot, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the prohibition of slaughter would injuriously affect the fodder resources of the State, and directly militate against the improvement of its live-stock.

(46) Decrepit cattle would materially compete with sound cattle for fodder—a state of things very undesirable in a country which depends very largely on efficient live stock for its agricultural prosperity. In fact the issue is so clear that Mr. H. M. A. Cook, C. B. E., viewing it free from prepossessions, unhesitatingly recommended "Destory all that consume fodder better used for good animals." Mr. M. G. Rama Rao also had the courage to recommend the destruction of aged and otherwise defective cattle. This quick and humane disposal is in vogue in all countries where no which immemorial obstacles of a religious and sentimental nature exist.

(47) It has, no doubt, been urged by some advocates of prohibition that the situation could be met by setting apart larger areas for pasture, and by better conservation of common grazing grounds but while these measures are certainly desirable as enabling better care to be taken of animals which are really worth keeping, it would be a pity to dissipate the resources thus created for keeping alive at starvation point, a growing number of economically useless cattle.

Manure supply.

(48) There is a prevailing impression that the manure supply depends directly upon the number of cattle maintained and that in maintaining a large number of cattle useless for other purposes, the raiyat is justified by the larger quality of manure that he will get from them. This assumption is also at the root of the assertion made by some witnesses that the prohibition of slaughter will not affect the fodder supply, as there will be a larger quantity of manure. This is a position worth examining. Dr. Narasimha Iyengar, the Agricultural Chemist is of opinion that manure is in proportion to the quantity of food consumed and not to the number of consumers that both the quantity and quality of manure depend on the feeding of the animals; the better the feed, the better the manure. It follows therefore that an increase in the number of cattle, without a corresponding increase in the quantity of fodder, is not calculated to increase the manure supply; nor in view of the utter inadequacy of the present fodder supply to existing cattle already referred to, is a diminution likely to result from a decrease in the number of cattle, provided there is no corresponding decrease in the fodder supply, and there is thus a larger quantity of food for the survivors. It is in fact probable that in the latter contingency there will be an improvement in the quality of the manure.

(49) This however, seems to be a debatable point, but even if the popular view is correct that manure is dependent on the number of cattle kept, and that therefore prohibition of slaughter is likely to result in an increase in the quantity of manure, it seems certain that the resulting advantage will not be commensurate with the cost, and that it will not be important enough to countervail the other drawbacks incidental to the maintenance of otherwise useless cattle. This is the opinion of Mr. William Smith, the Imperial Dairy Expert, and of a number of other competent witnesses, and seems to us acceptable.

Effect of prohibition on the hide trade.

(50) There is general agreement that prohibition of the slaughter of cattle would injuriously affect the trade in hides. It is stated that the hide of a slaughtered animal is superior in texture and quality to that of one which has died a natural death, and that it tans better and fetches a higher price. Mr. Modi Abdul Gafoor, a prominent leather merchant, whose evidence greatly impressed the Committee, states that the value of the skin of a slaughtered animal is Rs. 5 or 6, while that of an

animal which had died a natural death is about one rupee less. It would seem that the former are mostly exported, and the latter used for local consumption, and that both kinds find a ready sale. This witness estimates that 3 to 4 lakhs of skins of slaughtered animals are brought for sale. This figure receives corroboration from the estimate given by various witnesses regarding the total number of cattle slaughtered in the State. The prohibition of cattle slaughter would at the most have the effect of reducing the price of 3 or 4 lakhs of hides by a rupee each that is to say the loss to the hide trade by the measure would be about 3 to 4 lakhs of rupees. It is impossible therefore to endorse the view taken by some witnesses that "the prohibition of cow slaughter will affect the hide trade, deprive the country of 50 lakhs annually, close the tanneries, and increase unemployment." The view expressed by Mr. W. H. Smith that "the hide value of a slaughtered cow is 10 to 20 per cent greater than that of one dying naturally" and that by prohibition of slaughter the "hide trade will be affected to a little extent" seems correct, and worthy of acceptance. It is quite conceivable, however, that the deprivation of hides of slaughtered animals might affect the profits of some tanneries which specialise in superior grades of leather, but there seems to be no ground for the apprehension that prohibition would have a serious effect on the hide trade as a whole.

Effect of prohibition on the ability of raiyats to maintain useful cattle.

(51) The necessity to maintain aged and unserviceable cattle is bound to have a serious effect on the ability of the owner to maintain useful cattle. The difficulty is so direct and real that even now raiyats are driven by the pinch of necessity to sell their old and decrepit cattle to middlemen or butchers with the full knowledge that the animals are thereby put on the road to slaughter. The prohibition of slaughter will deprive them of this method of disposal, and compel them to choose between accepting this additional dead weight on their already overburdened shoulders, or turning their unserviceable cattle loose to die a lingering death compared to which the swiftness of the butcher's knife were mercy. It is easy to imagine the nuisance that prowling herds of starving and masterless cattle would be to an agricultural country side.

The moral responsibility of the State implied in prohibition.

(52) It was urged that there could be no justification for fettering one's discretion in the disposal of useless cattle, unless the State could accept the responsibility for looking after such cattle. This is no doubt an extreme statement of the case; but there is some force in the view that the State should not, in fairness, impose on cattle owners the burden of keeping useless animals, without at the same time sanctioning facilities such as would materially help them to bear the burden. The facilities generally recommended are the establishment of pinjrapoles, the extension of gomals and pasture, and the stimulation and organisation of private charity and benevolence by extensive propaganda. It is proposed that the State should assume full resposibility for these measures, but it is suggested that the cost of institutions like pinjrapoles, requiring direct expenditure should be met as far as possible by stimulating and organising public charity.

Go-salas, pinjrapoles, their maintenance, etc.

(53) As we had occasion to observe repeatedly, practical action has been sadly short of religious and humane sentiment in regard to the provision of asylums for decrepit and unprofitable cattle. There are at present no go-salas or pinjrapoles in the Districts of Bangalore, (except one in Civil and Military Station, Bangalore), Kolar, Hassan, Shimoga, Kadur and Tumkur. There is one at Mysore at the foot of the Chamundy Hills and

one at Davangere. There are some philanthropic societies organised in Bangalore City and Tumkur Town who are interested themselves in opening a go-sala in each of the two places. It is stated that a proposal for erecting a building for a go-sala at Goribidnur has been sent up by the Gorakshana Sangha of that place.

(54) The need for go-salas and pinjrapoles is generally admitted by those who are in favour of prohibition; but, opinion is divided in regard to the source from which the cost could be met. The weight of opinion seems to be on the side of leaving their institution to the charity of the public.

Sale or export of cattle for slaughter, etc.

(55) The majority of witnesses are for prohibiting by legislation for the export or sale of cows for the express purpose of slaughter. Not many advocate general prohibition of all export or sale, and indeed, such prohition would do untold damage in a country like Mysore, which is famed for its breed of cattle, and derives a large return from export of live stock.

(56) We agree with W. H. Smith's opinion that "the more the State can increase the export trade in cattle, the greater will be the value of State cattle." Mr. Smith is opposed to legislation prohibiting sale or export of cattle even for purposes of slaughter; and indeed it would be so difficult to discriminate between export and sale for slaughter from those for other purposes, that this difficulty would be insurmountable in practice.

Import of beef in to the State.

(57) As may be expected, Hindus are in favour of prohibiting import of beef, while Mahommedans and others deprecate interference. We are of opinion that it would be impracticable to prohibit the import of beef into the State.

GENERAL.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AND OTHER MEASURES.

Effect of the evidence.

(58) The generality of Hindu opinion is in favour of prohibition and the generality of Mahommadan opinion is against it. But, in both cases, there are some notable exceptions. The majority of Christian opinion is against prohibition, but a strong minority is not opposed to any measures calculated to promote inter-communal amity, though it would like a very strong case to be made out before recourse is had to legislation.

(59) Both people who would prohibit and those who are opposed to prohibition base their opinions on religious, economic and humanitarian grounds. While with the majority, religion is stressed as the ground for the prevention of slaughter, the objections of others are based on economic grounds and disapproval of interference with the exercise of the rights of property. A good deal of emphasis is laid by some Mahomedans and Christians on the claims of social harmony.

(60) Those who are in favour of legislation for prohibition of slaughter say that prohibition should be enforced by the direct action of the State; those who are opposed say that any action taken should be in the way of propaganda and persuasion, through Municipalities and local bodies. It is also said that such legislation would injuriously affect the classes who are accustomed to use beef as a cheap form of food, and that if a considerable section of the population is likely to feel aggrieved thereby, measures in the direction of increased production of food grains and conciliatory propaganda, may be undertaken.

Opinion of the Committee.

(61) In arriving at an opinion, we have endeavoured to consider the questions referred to us from all points of view, and

we have applied our minds closely to the several important issues involved in the light of the evidence before us. Difficulties and differences were fully and frankly discussed, and we are glad to be able to say that the conclusions here submitted contain our unanimous opinion.

(62) The committee have before them the following weighty pronouncement of Mahatma Gandhi:

"In matters of religion, I am against any State interference and the cow question is in India a mixed matter of religion and economy.

x x x x

In India which I consider to be as much the land of Hindus born in it as of Mussalmans, Christians and others born in it, even a Hindu State may not prohibit cow-slaughter for purposes considered to be religious by any of its subjects, without the consent of the intelligent majority of such subjects, so long as such slaughter is conducted in private and without any intention of provocating or giving offence to Hindus."

On the economic side, the weight of reason is against prohibition. On the religious side, there is no doubt whatever of the extent and genuineness of Hindu sentiment in favour of the protection of cattle; but there is equally little doubt that the majority of Muslims believe that the sacrifice of cows on certain occasions is a sacred injunction. Deference is no doubt due to the weight of sentiment of the Hindu population, but there should be no unnecessary interference with what are believed to be the religious rights or liberties of any other section of the subjects of the State. The legislative prohibition of the slaughter of all cattle or even of all cows, would probably offend the religious sentiment of Muslims, and be resented by important sections of the population as an unwarranted encroachment of the rights of private property.

(63) Such a measure of general prohibition would to some extent affect the food supply of the poorest classes of some communities. It would also add to the burden of the ryots and act as a drag on agricultural progress and improvement of livestock. Its result on the hide trade, though not very important would still be appreciable and there would also be some disturbance of occupations.

(64) We have carefully considered the possibility of a compromise between deference to Hindu sentiment, and the other important considerations indicated above, and endeavoured to work out a practicable *via media*, which while satisfying the most legitimate demands of the former, involves no invasion of the religious rights of non-Hindus and does not materially jeopardise the economic interests of the community. Opinion is unanimous about the desirability of preventing the slaughter of cows which are present or prospective milkers, and this would not interfere with the religious rites of the Muslim community or seriously affect the supply of beef available to the sections of the population with whom it is an article of food. We do not think it necessary to urge that there should be legislative enactment to prevent slaughter of cattle from being conducted in public or in a manner calculated to wound Hindu sentiment, because we are aware that in this State, mutual respect and good will have always prevailed, and there has been no case of disturbance caused by disregard of feelings in respect of cows. The ordinary criminal law provides sufficiently against cases of wanton insult to religious feelings.

(65) We are unanimously of opinion that legislation is necessary, but that for the present the limit of legislation should be to prohibit the slaughter of all heifers, cows in milk, and pregnant cows. Protection should of course be extended to cows only temporarily dry, and may also be extended to cows still capable of becoming in milk, if provisions could not be devised to avoid harassment or administrative inconvenience. This we think is the extent to which legislation might legitimately proceed in the prohibition of cow slaughter; but we wish to emphasise that by far

the largest part of the problem has to be solved by society, and enlightened public opinion. Hindu sentiment abhors all cow-slaughter; the State on composite considerations of expediency can prohibit only a very small portion of such slaughter. But humanity and enlightened feelings of communal reciprocity, without which there can be no healthy social life—and no law can work satisfactorily without detriment to the highest public good—ought to arrive at a practical compromise where the feelings of the Hindus are respected without any essential sacrifice of the religious sentiments, the comforts and convenience of other communities. This is an adjustment which in our opinion had best be left to mutual good will and good sence, as State interference is likelier to empasise rather than compose differences.

(66) We would also say that mere sentiment however intense, can never secure protection to cattle without organised efforts to provide an asylum for old and unserviceable animals. Charity and economics have perhaps not much in common, but a charitable programme framed in utter disregard of economic forces has no chance of practical execution. We have seen how in spite of sincere and inborn deference for the cow, poor Hindus are driven by sheer want, to sell it with the full knowledge that they are starting it on the way to the shambles. We would therefore impress on our countrymen the necessity of organised effort to provide for the care of decrepit cattle.

(67) Under the restricted measures of protection proposed by us, the establishment of pinjrapoles, etc., will not become an imperative duty of the State. We have already stated our view that if the State should compel people to maintain uneconomical animals, it could not divest itself of a moral responsibility to shoulder at least a part of the burden thus imposed; but since the present proposal is only to compel the maintenance of cattle which *prima facie* earn their keep, the responsibility is correspondingly diminished. The Deputy Commissioners who were consulted are unanimously of opinion that the establishment of gosalas, pinjrapoles, etc., might be left to private charity and we endorse this view.

(68) We enumerate below the measures, which in our opinion Government should adopt to supplement the legislation we have recommended above:—

(69) *Firstly*, propaganda work should be conducted appealing to the kindness and humanity which are never absent in the human breast. Charity should be organised, and appeals made to each community to respect, and avoid what is likely to offend the feelings of other communities.

(70) The slaughter of cattle, and of cows in particular, should be carefully divested of all features of offence, and of circumstances likely to make it a demonstration of anti-Hindu feeling. Cows should not for instance be led in procession for sacrifice or slaughter, and the open exposure of beef for sale near thoroughfares should be avoided.

(71) *Secondly*, pinjrapoles and gosalas should be established with the aid of the State given through Municipalities and local Boards. A system of inspection to see that they are properly maintained, will have to be organised. Proper use should be made of the manure, etc., derived in the Pinjrapoles. Sanitary arrangements in such places will have to be carefully attended to by the men of the Civil Veterinary Department.

(72) *Thirdly*, there should be ample provision for grazing and other fodder facilities. The grazing lands should be free of assessment and should be provided with enclosures, without which reservation for pasture would be sheer waste of public resources. The amount of land available should bear some proportion to the number of cattle to be maintained. A beginning may be made by providing facilities for the cattle organised in Gosalas. Where villagers undertake to maintain all their cattle and Village Panchayets see to the efficiency of the local arrangements, special grazing lands for such cattle may also be provided.

(73) *Fourthly*, the State may also subsidise Humanitarian Leagues, which have for their object the abolition of cruelty to animals.

(74) But no measure, however generous or well worked, would be productive of lasting good, without a wise and steady policy of regulating cattle-breeding so as to secure continuous improvement of the cattle of the country, and keep their number within the limit imposed by our resources. This involves the strengthening of the cattle breeding operations, and Civil Veterinary Departments, the maintenance of a sufficient number of good breeding bulls, and the compulsory castration of scrub bulls. No bull should be kept uncastrated without a license from competent authority.

(75) We cannot do better than close this report, with the memorable words which our Beloved Sovereign addressed to his people, from a heart overflowing with love on the happy occasion of the Silver Jubilee of His Highness' reign.

"I pray that a similar spirit may extend itself to the dumb creation, and that we may see animals, and especially those we hold sacred, treated with ever increasing consideration for the feelings they cannot express."

K. P. PUTTANNA CHETTY,
(Chairman).
C. B. RAMA RAO.
D. V. GUNDAPPA.
B. ABDUR RAHMON.
M. RAMACHANDRA RAO SINDIA.
S. PAIS.
S. VENKATESAIYA.
N. RAMA RAO,
(Secretary).

BANGALORE CITY,
12*th December* 1929.

No. P. 4405—*Pol.* 188-29-2, *dated* 19—20*th February* 1930.

Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to designate under Rule 23 of the Mysore Arms Rules 1926, the Drivers and Operators of the Pumping Establishment of the Water Supply Departments as persons to whom no fee is chargeable for a license in Form IX of the revised Arms Rules in respect of a gun or a revolver with a reasonable quantity of ammunition for the same.

No. P. 4430—*Legis.* 13-29-56, *dated* 20—21*st February* 1930.

In exercise of the powers vested in them under section 11 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Regulation, 1928, Government are pleased to issue the following further amendment to the Mysore Motor Vehicles Rules published with Notification No. P. 3015—Legis. 21-22-10, dated 4th December 1924 :—

Amendment.

For Sub-Rule (2) of Rule 13, as amended by Notification No. P. 6261—Legis. 6-28-25, dated 20th April 1929, the following shall be substituted :—

"(2) In the Cities of Bangalore and Mysore and in the local area within the jurisdiction of the Kolar Gold Fields Sanitary Board, when acetylene or electric lamps or lamps of any other description giving a powerful and intense light are used as head lights on any motor vehicle, the glare from such lights shall be satisfactorily counteracted by

(*a*) placing a pink paper over the lower half of the reflector, or
(*b*) painting the upper half of the glass white, or
(*c*) coating the bulbs with white paint, or
(*d*) having bulbs of frosted glass."

No. P. 4471—*Cts.* 117-29-9, *dated* 24*th February* 1930.

Under section 14 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1904, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to appoint Mr. Abdul Rahman, Coffee Planter, Mudgere, as Special Magistrate for the Bench Court at Mudgere, with the powers of a Magistrate of the Third Class, for a period of two years.

By Order,
P. MAHADEVAYYA,
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.